

RECEIVED MEMORANDUM

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

TO:

THE CRAMMISSION 3: 58

APR 1 9 2005

FROM:

Utilities DivisionOMMISSION AZ CURPIT CONTROL

April 19, 2005

DATE:

DOCKETED BY

RE:

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF TONTO BASIN WATER COMPANY, INC., AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR APPROVAL OF A WATER AUGMENTATION SURCHARGE TARIFF (DOCKET NO. W-03515A-05-0187)

### Introduction

On March 15, 2005, Tonto Basin Water Company, Inc. ("Company") filed a Water Augmentation Surcharge Tariff. This proposed tariff would allow the Company to make monthly adjustments to its rates and charges for water service to recover costs incurred for water augmentation costs, including bulk water purchases and transportation, which could occur if a curtailment plan tariff is approved by the Commission.

# Waiving the Timeclock

On March 17, 2005, the Company docketed a letter agreeing to waive the applicable timeclock.

# Company's Water Systems

The Company is located in the Roosevelt Lake area in Gila County and Florence area in Pinal County. The five independent water systems are; Lake Roosevelt Gardens East, Roosevelt Lake Estates, Lake Roosevelt Gardens West, North Bay and Cactus Forest Systems serving a total of approximately 2,100 customers.

#### **Proposed Water Augmentation Surcharge Tariff**

The Company's proposed water augmentation surcharge tariff was developed based on the tariff approved for Pine Water Company, Inc. ("Pine Water") in Decision No. 65914 (May 16, 2003). The surcharge will be calculated by:

"Dividing the total water hauling costs incurred in a given month by the amount of water sold that month. The resulting rate per 1,000 gallons will then be multiplied by the gallons used in that month for each customer to arrive at the surcharge per 1,000 gallons. The resulting water augmentation surcharge would then be charged in the next month's billing cycle as a separate line item on the customer's bill."

40

THE COMMISSION April 19, 2005 Page 2

According to the Company, the imposition of this surcharge will have no impact on the rate of return realized by the Company.

# **Conclusions**

Staff has reviewed the proposed surcharge tariff and finds that this request can only be considered in the context of a rate case filing. The requested surcharge is not revenue neutral and would increase or decrease the Company's revenues or expenses.

# **Staff's Recommendation**

Staff recommends denial of the Company's Water Augmentation Surcharge Tariff.

Ernest G. Johnson

Director

**Utilities Division** 

EGJ:MSJ:red\TS

ORIGINATOR: Marlin Scott, Jr.

1	BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION				
2	JEFF HATCH-MILLER				
3	Chairman WILLIAM A. MUNDELL				
4	Commissioner MARC SPITZER				
5	Commissioner MIKE GLEASON				
6	Commissioner KRISTIN K. MAYES				
7	Commissioner				
8	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION ) DOCKET NO. W-03515A-05-0187				
9	OF TONTO BASIN WATER COMPANY,   DECISION NO				
10	APPROVAL OF A WATER ORDER				
11	AUGMENTATION SURCHARGE TARIFF				
	O. Martina				
12	Open Meeting May 3 and 4, 2005 Phoenix, Arizona				
13					
14					
15	BY THE COMMISSION:				
16	FINDINGS OF FACT				
17	1. Tonto Basin Water Company, Inc. ("Company") is certificated to provide water as a				
18	public service corporation in the State of Arizona.				
19	2. On March 15, 2005, the Company filed a water augmentation surcharge tariff.				
20	3. The Company's proposed tariff would allow the Company to make monthly				
21	adjustments to its rates and charges for water service to recover costs incurred for water				
22	augmentation costs, including bulk water purchases and transportation, which could occur if a				
23	curtailment plan tariff is approved by the Commission.				
24	4. On March 17, 2005, the Company docketed a letter agreeing to waive the				
25	applicable timeclock.				
26	5. The Company is located in the Roosevelt Lake area in Gila County and Florence				
27	area in Pinal County. The five independent water systems are; Lake Roosevelt Gardens East,				
28					

Roosevelt Lake Estates, Lake Roosevelt Gardens West, North Bay and Cactus Forest Systems serving a total of approximately 2,100 customers.

6. The Company's proposed water augmentation surcharge tariff was developed based on the tariff approved for Pine Water Company, Inc. ("Pine Water") in its most recent rate case order, Decision No. 65914 (May 16, 2003). The surcharge will be calculated by:

"Dividing the total water hauling costs incurred in a given month by the amount of water sold that month. The resulting rate per 1,000 gallons will then be multiplied by the gallons used in that month for each customer to arrive at the surcharge per 1,000 gallons. The resulting water augmentation surcharge would then be charged in the next month's billing cycle as a separate line item on the customer's bill."

- 7. According to the Company, the imposition of this surcharge will have no impact on the rate of return realized by the Company.
- 8. Staff has reviewed the proposed surcharge tariff and finds that this request can only be considered in the context of a rate case filing. The requested surcharge is not revenue neutral and would increase or decrease the Company's revenues or expenses.
  - 9. Staff recommends denial of the Company's Water Augmentation Surcharge Tariff.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The Company is an Arizona public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV, Section 2, of the Arizona Constitution.
- 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over the Company and of the subject matter in this Application.
- 3. The Commission, having reviewed the request for approval of the tariff and Staff's Memorandum, dated April 19, 2005, and concludes that it is not in the public interest to approve the Water Augmentation Surcharge Tariff.
- 4. Under Article XV, Section 14 of the Arizona Constitution, the proposed tariff cannot be approved without a fair value finding.

27 | .

28 ...

Decision	NT <sub>a</sub>		
Decision	NO		

Decision No.

# <u>ORDER</u>

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the proposed Water Augmentation Surcharge Tariff for Tonto Basin Water Company, Inc. is denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order shall become effective immediately.

5	BY THE ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION					
6	DI IIII GIODING					
7						
8	CHAIRMAN	COMMISSIONER	COMMISSIONER			
9						
10						
11	COMMISSION	COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER				
12		IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I BR	IAN C. McNEIL. Executive			
13		Secretary of the Arizona Corp hereunto, set my hand and caus	ooration Commission, have			
14		Commission to be affixed at t	the Capitol, in the City o			
15		Phoenix, thisday of	, 2005.			
16						
17						
18		BRIAN C. McNEIL				
19		Executive Secretary				
20	D TO GET TER					
21	DISSENT:					
22	DISSENT:					
23						
24	EGJ:MSJ:red\TS					
25						
26	·					
27						
28						

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Decision No.

Docket No. W-03515A-05-0187